1	JUDGE RICHARD A. JONE	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR15-029-RAJ)
10	Plaintiff,)) UNOPPOSED MOTION TO
11	V. BRIAN FARRELL, Defendant.	OCONTINUE TRIAL AND OCCUPIENT PRETRIAL MOTIONS DATES OCCUPIENT
12		
13))
14	Brian Farrell, through his attorney, Assistant Federal Public Defender Nancy	
15	Tenney, respectfully requests a continuance of the trial date from November 30, 2015,	
16	to April 25, 2015. For the reasons set forth below, Mr. Farrell also requests a discovery	
17	deadline of December 4, 2015, and a deadline for the defense to file a motion to	
18	compel, if necessary, by December 11, 2015. This motion is made for the following	
19	reasons.	
20	Mr. Farrell is charged with conspiracy to distribute cocaine, heroin, and	
21	methamphetamine. The charge carries a ten-year mandatory minimum term of	
22	imprisonment. The Indictment alleges that Mr. Farrell participated in a large drug	
23	conspiracy by virtue of his employment with the online black market website known as	
24	"Silk Road 2.0." According to the government, Silk Road 2.0 offered buyers and sellers	
25	of drugs and other illegal commodities an anonymous platform upon which to transact	
26	business.	

On October 13, 2015, the government provided defense counsel a letter indicating that Mr. Farrell's involvement with Silk Road 2.0 was identified based on information obtained by a "university-based research institute" that operated its own computers on the anonymous network used by Silk Road 2.0. In response to this letter, undersigned counsel requested additional discovery from the government to determine the relationship between the "university-based research institute" and the federal government, as well as the means used to identify Mr. Farrell on what was supposed to operate as an anonymous website. To date, the government has declined to produce any additional discovery.

On November 1, 2015, this Court held a hearing in *United States v. Peterson-Siler*, CR 15-00118 RAJ, in which the defense requested the same discovery requested in this matter. At that hearing, this Court continued the trial and set a new date for the government to disclose additional discovery, as well as a briefing schedule to address a motion to compel disclosure should that become necessary. Given that these two cases present identical issues, Mr. Farrell respectfully requests that his trial be continued and that he be allowed to follow the briefing schedule set in *Peterson-Siler*.

For these reasons, the parties ask the Court to find that:

- (a) taking into account the exercise of due diligence, a failure to grant a continuance would deny counsel for the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, due to counsel's need for more time to review newly-disclosed evidence, consider possible defenses, and gather evidence material to the defense, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv); and
- (b) a failure to grant a continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i); and

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I certify that on November 5, 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of filing to all registered parties. s/ Charlotte Ponikvar Paralegal